	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/053,116	SCHULTZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Daniel P Stephenson	3672
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>abandoned</u>		
(1) <u>Daniel P Stephenson</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Arthur Navarro</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>14 October 2003</u>	Time: <u>10:00</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:  Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>□ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
•		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	'Applicant's Representative Si	gnature – if appropriate)



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was related to the attorney for the applicant, Mr. Navarro, that since no reply had been filed for the action mailed out 3/26/03 the case was going abandoned. Mr. Navarro contended that no action had been received. The examiner informed Mr. Navarro that a petition to withdraw holding of abandonment could be filed in that case, as shown in MPEP 711.03 (c) II.